DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 636 CG 031 429

AUTHOR Korostelina, Karina V.
TITLE Identity Based Training: Toward Peacebuilding in Multicultural Societies.
PUB DATE 2002-00-00
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Conflict Resolution; *Cross Cultural Training; Educational Games; *Ethnic Groups; Ethnic Studies; Foreign Countries; Group Activities; *Identification (Psychology); Learning Activities; *Social Integration; Social Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Social Identity; Ukraine

ABSTRACT

The article presents identity-based training created on the basis of the social identity theory, categorization theory and common identity model. Training consists of three parts: (1) multiplicity and salience of identity; (2) identity as a course of conflicts; (3) ways for tolerance recategorisation, decategorisation, and mutual differentiation. Special set of games and exercises were created and three series of both traditional and identity-based trainings were conducted for leaders of ethnic communities and non-government organizations of Crimea. To estimate the effectiveness of trainings the method of semantic differential was used before and after trainings. Results show that identity-based training in comparison with traditional ones influence transformation of evaluation of conflict toward more changeable and resolvable and provide more knowledge and understanding of communal conflict's roots. (Contains 2 tables and 66 references.) (JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 636

Identity Based Training: Toward Peacebuilding in Multicultural Societies

Karina V. Korostelina
Psychology Department
National Tavrida Vernadsky University,
Simferopol, Ukraine
Director of the Crimean Center for Conflict Resolution, Peace and Democracy
E-mail: carina@bair.crimea.com
Address: Komsomolskaya, 6, ap. 59
Simferopol, Ukraine, 95017

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. KOROSTELINA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CG031429

The article presents identity-based training created on the basis of the social identity theory, categorization theory and common identity model. Training consist of three parts: (1) multiplicity and salience of identity, (2) identity as a course of conflicts (3) ways for tolerance: recategorisation, decategorisation, and mutual differentiation. Special set of games and exercises were created and three series of both traditional and identity-based trainings were conducted for leaders of ethnic communities and non-government organization of Crimea. To estimate the effectiveness of trainings the method of semantic differential was used before and after trainings. Results show that identity-based training in comparison with traditional one influences transformation of evaluation of conflict toward more changeable and resolvable and provide more knowledge and understanding of communal conflict's roots.

In the last decades training became one of the most prevailing methods of conflict resolution and prevention. In contrast to the problem-solving workshop, which deals with analysis of conflict situation, the goal of the training is to develop the participants' skills. Developmental learning theories hypothesize that learning follows a sequence: experience- reflection- new understanding- new experience. Learning process in training consists of three basic stages: (1) awareness of existing and alternative assumptions, thinking and behaviors; (2) understanding, defined as the ability to appreciate and articulate concepts and knowledge how to use them; (3) competence in applying the concepts without conscious effort and going beyond them to generate new ideas (Ricigliano, 2001). According to Lederach, (1997) there are two aims of training in the conflict resolution field: (1) raising awareness and educate people about conflict (understanding of sources, dynamics and progression of conflict and ways of conflict resolution) and (2) imparting skills for dealing with conflict (specific techniques and approaches for dealing with conflict in the form of analytical, communication, negotiation skills). Along with developing of skills, participants of training realize their conflict-related, competitive behavior and change it to cooperative, problem solving one (LeBaron, 2000).

Lederach (1995) has articulated the distinction between training approaches which impose (prescribe) a conciliation model and the trainer/madiator's knowledge, and approach which draw out (elicit) the common sense knowledge of trainees/ disputants in order to facilitate the creation of new, culturally appropriate models. In prescriptive model training is content-oriented and trainer works as expert, model and facilitator; in elicitive model training is process-oriented, it is discovery and creative process; and trainer works as catalyst and facilitator. To be successful training must invite dialogue, through which idea will be analyzed, adopted and acquired.

Training can be a successful tool of peacebuilding; it is the process of strategic capacity (inherent capabilities and understandings of people related to the challenge of conflict) and relationship building. In this case, training has to lead to creation of dynamic process involving

people concerned with conflict resolution. According to Lederach (1997) training is the most strategically useful at the middle level, but can be used at any levels of leadership within society.

Training in specific conflict management should be based on the nature of this conflict and be devoted to knowledge and skills that are currently required and demanded. As was stressed by Schoenhaus (2001), "skills most commonly taught in the field are no longer adequate to cover the burgeoning responsibilities that are being undertaken in current international conflict engagement" (p.5). Successful training must be based on a consideration of the nature of a particular conflict and address its most important issues. At the same time, training must be transformable for another conflicts with similar peculiarities. Training can be used not only in open conflict, but also can be a tool for "early warning" framework, adequately alerting and engaging the communities. So, for creation successful training for ethnic communities in the Crimea, some analysss of conflict situation on the peninsula has to be done.

Crimea is one of the many regions of the former Soviet Union fraught with economic, social and political instability. Bordering the Black Sea, the Crimean peninsula was once a prime vacation spot for Soviet citizens. It is now an area of Ukraine, which struggles with the highest unemployment rates in the country, political upheaval, and brewing ethnic tension.

The Crimean peninsula covers a territory of approximately 26,000 square kilometers. The population is nearly 2.5 million. Ethnic Russians comprise 64% of the population, 23% are Ukrainians, 10% Crimean Tatars, and 3% Belorussians, Armenians, Greek, Germans, and others. Though the peninsula was considered a Russian territory until 1954, the Russian majority faces a predicament in that it is now governed by the Ukrainian state. Similarly, the Ukrainian population struggles with the fact that they are a minority in their own land. Even more complex is the situation of the Crimean Tatars. In 1944, the Crimean Tatar population (250,000 people) was deported to Central Asia and Siberia en masse by Stalin. During the last ten years, approximately half of the deported population of ethnic Tatars have returned to their "homeland"

only to find that they are repeatedly denied citizenship rights, access to education, employment and housing.

Now they are trying to restore their ethnic identity as inhabitants of the Crimea and estimate all social-political situations in the framework of their ethnicity. Russian in Crimea also feels threatened by development of Ukraine as a nation-state (Korostelina, 2000).

The national identity building, which is now taking place throughout the post-communist space, became a framework for startup conditions, escalation and self-perpetuation of conflicts in the Crimea. As Kelman (1997) pointed out, national identity, national self determination and the establishment of state represent major sources of human dignity and self-esteem of population, but also lead for systematic efforts to destroy other peoples as part of establishing an ethnically pure, homogeneous state. Conflict can develop when the identity chosen by an individual is incompatible with the identity imposed by others or the social context in which identity is constantly being recreated (Kelman, 1982; Stein, 1998; Stern, 1995).

Now in the Crimea ethnic identity of Russians is incompatible with national identity; and regional and ethnic identity of Crimean Tatars are mismatched with Crimean Government's orientation to Russia. Existing conflict in the Crimea can be estimated as identity-based conflict also because it deals with basic needs and values. Such identity conflicts contain existential needs, values, safety, dignity, control over destiny and rooted in complex and multidimensional psychological, historical, and cultural factors. Among needs are needs for participation, consistency, security, recognition, and distributive justice. Frustration of these basic needs, along with a denial of human rights, leads to social conflicts (Fisher, 1997).

As Rothmans (1997) stresses, the differences between identity and interest conflicts are not precise and legible in practice. All identity conflicts contain interest conflicts; more over, many ignored or unresolved interest-based conflicts can become identity conflicts. Burton (1987, 1990) calls such conflicts "deep-rooted conflicts" and stresses that they are not based on negotiable interest and position, but on underlying needs that cannot be compromised. Azar

suggests (1990) that source of such protracted social conflicts is not in economic and power, but in the denial of elements necessary to the development of all people, and whose pursuit is therefore a compelling need. In identity conflict "groups struggle for their basic physical and moral survival" (Rothman, 1997, p.9). Such conflicts arise when identity groups perceive that they are oppressed and victimized through a denial of recognition, security, equity, and political participation (Fisher, 1997).

The concepts of protracted social conflict, deep-rooted conflicts and identity-based conflict are compatible with identity theory (Tajfel, 1986; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Watherell,1987;) and the common in-group identity model (Gaetner, Dovidio, Nier, Ward, & Banker, 1999; Gaetner, Dovidio, Houlette, Johnson, & Mc Glynn, 2000).

According to Henri Tajfel, the author of social identity theory, identity is defined as a "part of individuals' self-concept, which derives from the knowledge of their membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership" (Tajfel, 1981; p. 255). In his research Tajfel (1986) has observed that, contrary to Sheriff's theory, there were two distinct groups seemed sufficient for the creation of group identities which reduced the importance of each member's individual identity. Self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987) explains the emergence of group-level processes in terms of the functioning of the self-concept and at the same time assumes that group processes reciprocally mediate self-categorization and cognition. They conceptualize the identification process in three stages. First, individuals define themselves as members of social groups; second, they learn the stereotypical norms of those groups; and third, under conditions where a particular ingroup category becomes salient, they tend to employ the ingroup attributes to decide on the appropriate conduct in the given context.

Common in-group identity model (Gaetner et al., 1999; Gaetner et al., 2000) involves interventions to change people's conceptions of the membership from different groups to one,

more inclusive group or to subgroups within a more inclusive superordinate group. Common in-group identity can make attitudes toward former out-group members more positive.

As theory suggests, acquiring of national identity depends on three factors: (1) the adoption of the specific elements of the national identity, i.e., of the beliefs, values, assumptions, and expectations that make up the national identity as a collective product, (2) the development of an orientation to the nation itself (Herman, 1977), and self-definition as members of the nation (Kelman, 1997).

The process of national identity formation in multicultural society is inherently conflict. Research shows that meaning of national identity can influence attitudes toward other groups and political situations, so individuals with nativist sense of American identity (such as being Christian) negatively regard immigrants, and see adoption of American customs as an obligatory for them (Citrin, Reingold, &Green, 1990; Citrin, Wong, & Duff, 2000). As research on ethnic and racial identities proves, strong identity as a member of subordinate group in the United States or Israel results in a diminished sense of patriotism (Sidanius, Feshbach, Levin, and Pratto, 1997). Germans with stronger regional identity feel more positively about their region than about the nation and demonstrate greater regional homogeneity (Simon, Kulla, &Zobel, 1995).

The identity-based training was created using incites from social-psychological theories of identity. The aim of our training is to show the role of identity in increasing conflict and ways for tolerance. The goals of the training are:

- to show the existence of multiple system of identities;
- to demonstrate influence of salient identity on stereotypes and attitudes;
- to develop tolerant multi-identity approach for situations, groups and people;
- to show the patterns of formation of identities and to introduce the intergroup dynamics as roots of conflict;
- to build skills of analysis and recognizing of identity-based conflicts;

- to demonstrate the ways of tolerance such as decategorization, recategorization and mutual differentiation;
- to develop skills of conflict resolution, using peculiarities of group dynamics.

Training is generally done in tree segments: (1) multiplicity of identity; (2) identity as a source for conflict; (3) ways for tolerance.

In second part presents different negative impacts of identity on intregroup relations and conflict development. The third part is devoted to the ways of tolerance through identity change such as decategorization, recategorization and mutual differentiation.

Part I: Multiplicity and salience of identity

Theoretical source

The first part is devoted to identity as a source of behavior, specifically, to multiplicity of identity, identity salience and influence of identity on our behavior. Multiplicity of identities was stressed by Adler (1994), Crenshaw (1998), King (1988), who pointed out that system of identities is not simply combination of those elements, but has multiple effect. There are some approaches for so-called multiple social identities. According to Brewer's classification of identity's theories (Brewer, 2001), theories of person-based social identity (Cross, 1991; Phinney, 1990; Skevington & Baker, 1989) suggest that self-concept consists of different stereotypes, attitudes and values, which person receives from membership in groups. Some of these peculiarities can be more salient, but they all serve as parts of single representation of the individual self. Theories of relational social identities assume that the self is a set of discrete identities, each of which is differentiated from other role identities of the person. But this system is organized and structured and determines which identity will be salient in particular social context (Stryker & Serpe, 1994; Stryker, 2000). Theories of group-based social identities suggest that identity system depends on social context (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & Mc Garty, 1994), but some social categories can be relatively stable across time and situations (Abrams, 1999).

As identity theory pointed out, situation and the more numerous and authorial outgroup influence the development of salient identity. Identity salience can be defined as the most important identity for the individual, and it can be influenced by such factors as permeable/ impermeable group boundaries, positive or negative intergroup comparisons, identity distinctiveness issues and socialization processes (Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki, 1989; Brewer, 1991, 1996; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Salience can vary on a continuum from strong to weak. As Phinney (1991) shows, persons with strong ethnic identity salience have strong feelings for their group memberships, evaluate their group positively, prefer, or are comfortable with, their group membership, are interested in the group, its culture and history.

Striker has argued that various identities exist in a hierarchy of salience, and one identity can be invoked over others not only because of its salience, but also because of the level of commitment to that identity. (Striker, 1969). If some identity has salience for a long period, it becomes a central identity, and it has a strong influence on behavior. Ethnic identity salience may have both stable and situational characteristics. Ting-Toomey (2000) notes that "for some individuals, ethnic identity only becomes salient when they are forced to confront interpersonal issues of "being different" like stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination. According to Oakes' functional approach to salience (Oakes, 1987), the use of category in a given context depends on the accessibility of the category and the fit between the category and reality. As Huddy (2001) showed, four factors help to acquire identity: the valence of group membership, the defining social characteristics of typical group members, the core values associated with membership, and the characteristics of common outgroups who help to define what the ingroup is not. Gerson (2001) suggests that development and salience of identity are influenced by practices, "what people do and how they conceptualize or represent what they do as constituting membership in various group"(p.183).

The salient identities are connected with stable attitudes and worldview. It was shown in research that an individual's ways of perception, cognition, judgement are strongly determined

by a group's cognitive peculiarities. Shared social identity of group members makes it possible for them to produce social validated knowledge, shared beliefs about ways of perceiving, thinking, and doing what we assume to be appropriate in terms of the demands of objective reality. Individual perception, cognition and behavior are interdependent with group values, norms and ways of perception and cognition, individual perception and cognition, which rest on socially validated knowledge, theories, methods (Ting-Toomey, 2000, Turner et al., 1986).

Research also demonstrates that strong identification with racial and ethnic group among South Africans influence their need for group solidarity, antipathy toward outgroups, feeling of threat and intolerance (Gibson, Gouws, 1999). Other results also suggest the role of subjective group membership in shaping political attitudes and behavior (Conover, 1988; Miller, Gurin, Gurrin, &Malanchuk, 1981), stronger correlations between group identification and out-group hostility was founded in some research (Branscombe &Wann, 1994: Grant & Brown, 1995). Research of Duckitt and Mphuthing (1998) shows that Black African identification was significantly related to attitudes toward Africans Whites, but longitudinal analyses, however, suggested causal impacts from attitudes to identification.

Our research demonstrates that peoples with different salient identities have different structures of consciousness, different criteria for estimation of situations, different attitudes toward economic and political situations. Moreover, it was shown in our research, that the main autostereotype (identity stereotype) influences the perception of other groups. For example, in the Crimea this tendency is more pronounced for Crimean Tatars, who are reversing the autostereotyped "self-confidence," use "lacking self-confidence" four times more often than other negative heterostereotypes to describe the Slavs. The same tendency was found in value systems: the most important values (family for the Crimean Tatars, and honesty and responsibility for the Slavs) are used to create a negative image of another ethnic group. In other words, since the Slavs see themselves as honest, they see the Crimean Tatars as dishonest (Korostelina, 2000).

Exercises

We have created some exercises in order to introduce multiplicity of identities and decrease salience of ethnicity. One of the main exercises - the "Circle of Identities" - consists of 4 stages. During this exercise trainees can see the differences between different types of identities and possibility to use different identities in their life. Trainees understand that they are not only members of ethnic groups or families and that they have multiple identities, that help to make their salient identities more "soft" and "flexible".

(1) At the beginning of the exercise the participants are asked to write the answers for question "Who am I?" in the nested system of 5 circles. The main answer must be written in the central circle and less important answers – in others circles. The less important identity must be written in the last fifth circle.

(2) Participants fasten papers with their circles to their clothes and walk, viewing the circles of other participants. They can find the circles, similar to their own, discuss them with other participants. In the end of this stage all participants arrange group discussion of their impressions.

(3) Participants are asked to write 3-4 personal features, which better characterized each identity in their circles. For example, if one of identities is mother, it may be such features as kind, careful, attentive. It must be 5 sets of personal features according to each type of identity.

(4) One of the participants introduces all 5 his or her identities and one set of features. Other participants try to guess the connection between identity and features.

Another exercise- "Changing the identities"- shows the influence of identity on behavior in certain situation. It is conducted in the form of role-play game. Four participants play two role games about family conflict. In one game father plays his role as a lawyer, who used his professional principles in his everyday life. In the second game he plays his role as a Farther of family who values the honor of his family.

Others participants also change their identities and after finishing the role game they

discuss how their behavior changed depending on identity.

Part II: Identity as a basis for conflict

Theoretical source

The aim of the second part is to show the patterns of formation of identities and such phenomenon as negative comparison, in-group favoritism, biases, the ultimate attribution error, metacontrast, the out- group homogeneity effect, image of enemy (Tajfel, 1986; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Turner et al., 1987). By introducing the intergroup dynamics as roots of conflict we show how identity leads to conflict.

The basic assumption of Tajfel's theory is that people strive for a positive social identity. As social identity is derived from membership in groups, a positive social identity is the outcome of favorable social comparisons made between the in-group and other social groups (Druckman, 1994). According to social identity theory, each identity is shaped as result of membership in ingroup and as an opposition (comparison) with outgroup (Tajfel, 1986; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Existence of outgroup, negative and conflict relations with it strengthenes group identity. (For example, effect of simple social categorization: Allen & Wilder, 1975; Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Brewer &Silver, 1978; Brever & Miller, 1984; Doise & Sinclair, 1973).

The principle of metacontrast (Turner et al, 1987) holds that a collection of stimuli is more likely to be categorized as an entity to the degree that the average differences perceived between those stimuli are less that the average differences perceived between them and the remaining stimuli that make up the frame of reference (Turner, 1984). Such processes lead to the perception of in-group differences as smaller than intergroup differences within the relevant comparative context. The out-group homogeneity effect leads to perception of out-groups as more homogenous than in-groups. Strong identification with one's group becomes a powerful source of identity, and putting down other groups may increase self-esteem and provide group solidarity; these behaviors may also lead to exaggerations of group differences and conflict between groups. Social psychology finds that social differentiation arises even in the absence of

material bases for conflict. Strong feeling of self-group centrality and superiority, attempts to maintain the security of one identity group breeds stereotyping and misplaced suspicion of other's intentions (Booth, 1979)

Interethnic stereotypes also occur as a results of perceptions of typical group characteristics on the basis of both experience- based knowledge, and values or beliefs about desirable behavior (Druckman, 1994; Rokeach, 1973. A stereotype is a group belief about another individual, group or state that includes descriptive, affective, and normative components (Stein, 1998). As research suggests, ethnicity characteristics have been associated with some of the most prominent inter-group stereotypes. Ethnic prejudices develop on the roots of the content of stereotypes (Allport 1954; Vinacke 1957). Research results provide the evidence that most of stereotypes are frequently inaccurate and they lead to all sorts of biases and prejudices (Fiske &Taylor, 1991; Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990). Need for identity and intergroup dynamics produce enemy images even in the absence of hostile intentions. They generate behavior that is hostile and confrontational, increasing the likelihood that an adversary will respond with hostile action.

Exercises

In second part we create win-or-lose situations for teams by using of simple exercise. We divide participants in two teams and put two lines of chairs. Each participant is asked to stand on the chair and one chair was free in each line. Then we ask participants to pass this free chair to the end of the line, put it down and step over chairs in order to have free chair in the beginning of line. Two teams must reach the finish line advancing in this way. In this competition only one team can win (in some trainings participants play ball in two teams). Then we introduce discriminative rules for the losing team. The participants of this team can't sit down, can't make breaks in their work, have to raise hand to ask question, can't begin conversation with representatives of wining team. Participants from wining team can sit, stand or walk, can make breaks and ask any questions. (In one training, which we conduct together with our colleagues

from ICAR, George Mason University in the Crimea in summer, members of wining team even could swim in the pool.) The aim of such discrimination is to show different mechanisms of intergroup relations. All participants must use this rules during next exercise and discussions: members of both team have to prepare list of values' triads. Two values in this triad have to be dispute and third values have to serve a frame for conciliation of two conflict values (for example, contradiction between housewife's responsibilities and career; peace and love in family as a basis for conflict resolution). Each team has to prepare as many values' triads as they can.

Then we ask people to send a greeting for another participant, this person can be member of either out-group or in-group. This exercise demonstrates the phenomenon of ingroup favoritism. In debriefing we discuss all emotions, feelings and thoughts, which arise during these exercises, such as a anger, feelings of "second rate people," indignation, and such phenomenon as negative comparison, stereotypes, biases, etc.

Such situation was used in famous "Blue eyes-Brown eyes" experiment, but in our training we created a real situation of competition and wining instead of using color of eyes as a reason for discrimination. We think that the reality of situation is very important for our purposes. After this exercise we demonstrate the movie about "Blue eyes - Brown eyes" experiment and discuss the role of identity in intergroup relations.

As trainings show, after only an a hour of work, participants from losing team became angry, they wanted to stop training, they didn't like people from wining team and attributed to them feeling of superiority, hard-heartedness and arrogance. They acted aggressively toward leader of the training (even hate me), and felt very uncomfortable and as a "people of second sort". To increase their self-esteem, members of losing team attribute to themselves such peculiarities as magnanimity and creativity and deny presence of such peculiarities among members of winning team. Their lists of values' triads were shorter then list of wining team and reflect their position: most of the values were connected with values of self- esteem, competition and equality. Exercise's condition didn't influence values of wining team.

When we asked people to send a greeting for another participant, members of losing team demonstrated phenomenon of ingroup favoritism: they sent greeting only for members of their team. Members of wining team didn't prefer members of their group and send greetings for members of both teams.

Part III: Ways for tolerance.

Theoretical source

The aim of the third part is to demonstrate such ways of reducing biases and conflict behavior as decategorization, recategorization and mutual differentiation. The decategorization means that members of two groups imagine themselves as a separate individuals(Wilder, 1981) or have personalized. In this case they can get to know each other or even become friends (Pettigrew, 1997) and out-group stereotypes and biases would reduced (Brewer &Miller, 1984). People think and categorize others as individuals rather than as group members. Repeated personalized interactions with a variety of out-group members should over time decrease the value of the category stereotype as a source of information about members of that group (Gaetner & Dovidio, 1999). More personated interaction produce individual perception of one another, positive attitudes, and reduce biases. This change can be described in terms: from "us and them" to "you and me".

The recategorization also can reduce intergroup biases and conflict. There are two ways of recategorization: crosscutting group membership and common in-group identity model. Crosscutting group membership means that members of another group are also members of one's own group on a different dimensions (Urban & Miller, 1998). Common in-group identity model "Involves interventions to change people's conceptions of the membership from different groups to one, more inclusive group or to subgroups within a more inclusive superordinate group" (Gaetner & Davidio, 2000, p.102). Common in-group identity can be formatted by increasing the salience of existing common superordinate membership or by using common goals, values and

aims.

Mutual differentiation means cooperative interdependence (Hewstone &Brown, 1986). If groups have complementary (different, but with the common aim) roles and tasks and recognize and appreciate the contributions of another team it has positive effect on intergroup attitudes.

Exercises

To show the influence of decategorization, we divide participants in two teams and proposed them discussion of roots of identity. One team has to defend thesis that identity is situational and can be constructed. Another team has to defend thesis that people receive identity from birth and it can't be change. We ask people to begin all their phrases in discussion with the words " My team suggests..." or "My team considers..." After half an hour we offer to continue discussion in pairs (two participants from different team). The discussion of such exercise shows that work in two teams leads to negative emotions and attitudes towards another group and work in pair can help to reduce such negative feeling.

To show the effect of mutual differentiation we use the version of the Prisoners' Dilemma. In this game "By the lake", 5 different plants and enterprises work, using the water from the lake for their manufacturing. Their actions such as dropping of polluted water, imposing a fine, cleaning of the lake and so on are connected with each other. Only one strategy- real cooperation- can help them to get the biggest profits.

To show the effect of recategorization we propose the game "The common holiday and common heroes". Participants have to discuss values, goals and history, which can be estimated as common one for different peoples.

Results and effectiveness of training

According to the results of debriefings after trainings, all exercises and information were useful and valuable for participants. Many of them told that they would use knowledge and skills in their work in communities, share new understanding of conflicts' roots with their friends

and contacts. Discussion showed that people realized the ways of tolerance; they had real desire to use new skills and experience to resolve conflicts in their communities. Participants told us after training: "Now I know why we have such problems, and I know- it is more important- what to do with conflict". One woman said: "It is very useful to show for all people in Crimea all this exercises, to teach them how people discriminate each other and why they do it. I will use these ways for tolerance in my work in community".

The role of evaluation is to determine what works and that doesn't in terms of the goals of trainers. As M. Ross stressed success of training should be understood in terms of multiple (often continuous) dimensions (Ross, 2001). As many practitioners point out, the main purpose and success of training are connected with improvement of the relation between opposing communities and builds a capacity for disputing parties to manage future problems. It is difficult to find adequate methods of training's evaluation because of existence of numerous independent variables, changing context of trainings, problems of instrumentation and so on. Proposed by M. Ross "good enough" evaluation requires using of best possible measure under difficult circumstances. For evaluation of our training we decided to apply pre- and post-test measure.

To study effectiveness of training we use comparative method, confronting the traditional and identity based trainings. Traditional training design contained such skills as conflict analysis, problem solving, cross-cultural communication, negotiation, mediation and facilitation. We organize two series of research, each of which included one traditional and one identity-based trainings. First series was conducted for members of NGOs, teachers and leaders of ethnic Crimean Tatars community in two villages of Simferopol district. The conditions of their life, compositions of trainees (by gender, age and level of education) in both trainings were equal. 21 trainees took part in traditional training and 24- in identity-based training. Training "Methods of conflict resolution" was conducted in August, 10-12, 2000 in village Marino and "Identity based peacebuilding" was conducted in August, 14-16 in village Kamenca with participation of Associate professor from Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution at George Mason

University, Tamra Pearson d'Estree. Second series were conducted for leaders of youth organizations of town of Simferopol. Compositions of trainees (by gender, age and level of education) in both trainings were equal. 15 trainees took part in traditional training and 14- in identity-based training. Both trainings were conducted in Simferopol during January 2001.

Our purpose was to study how trainings influence estimation of ethnic relations in the Crimea and opportunities of conflict resolution. We use a method of semantic differential, proposing 8 pairs of the fraises about conflict in Crimea. The results of two traditional trainings are presented in the Table I. The most significant changes are connected with estimation of third party intervention and possibility to avoid conflict on the basis of knowledge of its causes. After training trainees considered that third party intervention would be useful for conflict resolution in the Crimea and knowledge of conflict's roots can help to prevent conflict. The results of identity based training (Table II) show, that trainees changes their opinion about possibility to resolve and controlled conflict, to construct the common "we" and prevent conflict on the basis of knowledge. After trainings they asserted, that conflict could be prevented and resolved and pointed out that developing of common identity is one of the most important ways for tolerance. The revaluation of importance of knowledge for conflict prevention was more significant for participants of identity-based training.

So, results demonstrated that traditional trainings deals mostly with third party's skills and don't change significantly attitudes toward possibility of conflict prevention and resolution in societies with community conflicts. Identity-based trainings put less attention for third party intervention, but influence transformation of evaluation of conflict toward more changeable and resolvable and provide more knowledge and understanding of conflict's roots. We suggest that identity-based methods must be used with traditional methods as a basis for third-party methods of conflict resolution. Understanding of intergroup and interethnic dynamics, stereotypes, biases and discrimination will help to adopt third party methods and appreciate their role in conflict resolution.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D. (1999). Social identity, social cognition, and the self: the flexibility and stability of self-categorization. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp.197-229). Oxford: Blackwell.

Allen, V. L., &Wilder, D.A. (19975). Categorization, belief similarity, and group discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32,* 971-977

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Azar, E.E.(1990) *The management of protracted social conflict.* Hampshire, U.K.: Dartmouth Publishing.

Berry, J., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., &Bujaki, M. (1989) Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology, 38*, 185-206

Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973) Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behavior. *European Journal of Social psychology, 3,* 27-52.

Booth, K. (1979) *Strategy and ethnocentrism.* London: Croom Helm, 1979.

Branscombe, N., & Wann, D. (1994) Collective self –esteem consequences of outgroup derogation when a valued social identity is on trial. *European Journal of Social psychology, 24,* 641-657.

Brewer, M.B., & Silver, M. (1978). In-group bias as a function of task characteristics. *European Journal of Social psychology, 8,* 393- 400.

Brever, M.& Miller, N. (1984) Beyond the contact hypothesis: theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miler & M.Brewer (Eds.*), Groups in contact: the psychology of desegregation*(pp. 281-302). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Brewer, M. (1991) The social self: being same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17,* 475- 482.

Brewer, M. (1996) When contact is not enough: social identity and intergroup cooperation. *International journal of Intercultural relations, 20,* 291-303.

Brewer M. B. (2001) The many faces of social identity: implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology, 1,* 115-126.

Burton, J. W. (1987). *Resolving deep-rooted conflict: a handbook.* Lanham, Md.: Univ. Press of America.

Burton, J. W. (1990). *Conflict: resolution and prevention*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Citrin, J., Reingold, B., &Green, D.P. (1990). American identity and the politics of ethnic change. *Journal of Politics, 52,* 1124-1154.

Citrin, J., Wong, C.,& Duff, B. (2000). The meaning of American identity: Patterns of ethnic conflict and consensus. In R. Ashmore et al., (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict and conflict resolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1998). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. In A. Phillips (Ed.), *Feminism & politics* (pp.9-36). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cross, W.E. (1991). *Shades of black: Diversity in African- American identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Conover, P.J., (1988) The role of social groups in political thinking. British *Journal of Political Science, 18,* 51-76

Doise, W., & Sinclair, A. (1973). The categorization process in intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social psychology, 3,* 145-157.

Druckman, D. (1994) Nationalism, patriotism and group loyalty: a social psychological perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review,38*, 43-68.

Duckitt, J. & Mphuthing, T. (1998) Group identification and intergroup attitudes: a longitudinal analysis in South Africa. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 80-85.

Fisher, R. (1997). *Interactive conflict resolution*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Fiske, S.T., &Taylor, S.E. (1991) *Social cognition*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Gaetner, S.L., Dovidio, J.F., Nier, J.A., Ward, C.M.,& Banker, B.S. (1999) Across cultural divides: The value of a superordinate identity. In D. Prentice & D. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 173-212). New York: Sage

Gaetner, S.L., Dovidio, J.F., Houlette, M., Johnson, K. M., & Mc Glynn, E.A. (2000). Redusing intergroup conflict: From superordinate goals to decategorisation, recategorization, and mutual differentiation. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 4,* 98-114.

Gerson J. M. (2001) In between states: national identity practices among German Jewish immigrants. *Political Psychology, 1*, 179-198.

Gibson, J.L., & Gouwa, A. (1998). *Social identity theory and political intolerance in South Africa.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Houston.

Grant, P., & Brown, P. (1995). From ethnocentrism to collective protest: Responses to relative deprivation and threats to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*, 195-211.

Hamilton, D.L., Sherman, S.J., & Ruvolo, C.M. (1990) Stereotype- based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 35-60.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R.J. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the "contact hypothesis". In M. Hewstone, .& R.J. Brown (eds.,), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters.* Oxford, England:Basil Blackwell pp.1-44

Huddy, L. (2001) From social to political identity: A critical examination of Social Identity Theory. *Political Psychology, 1*, 127-156.

Kelman, H.C. (1982). Creating the conditions for Israeli- Palestinian negotiations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1*, 39-76.

Kelman, H. C. (1997). Nationalism, patriotism, and national identity: Social-psychological dimensions. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism in the lives of individuals and nations.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Korostelina, K.V. (2000). The Social – Psychological Roots of the Ethnic Problems in Crimea, *Democratizatsiya*, 8, 219-231.

Korostelina, K.V. (2000). Crimean Psychologists investigate multi-ethnic conflict and social change. Psychology International: Journal of American Psychological Association Office of International Affairs , 11, 1-3

Lederach J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation Across Cultures.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Lederach J. P. (1997). *Building peace: sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* Washington, DC: USIP.

Miller, A.H., Gurin,P., Gurin, G., &Malanchuk, O. (1981) Group counciousness and political participation. *American Journal of Political Science, 25*, 495-511

Oakes, P. (1987). The salience of social categories. In J.C. Turner, M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher, & M. S. Watherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998) Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49,65-85

Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic identity in adolescence and adulthood: Review of research. *Psychological Bulletin, 108,* 499-514.

Ricigliano, R. (2001). Best practices in training negotiators. In R.M. Schoenhaus. (Ed.), *Conflict management training.* Washington, DC: USIP.

Rokeach, M. (1973) *The nature of human values.* New York: Free Press.

Rothman, J. (1997). *Resolving identity-based conflict in nations, organizations, and communities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ross, M.H. (2001) Evaluation in conflict resolution training and practice. In R.M. Schoenhaus. (Ed.), *Conflict management training.* Washington, DC: USIP.

Rothman, J. (1998). *Mediation theory and identity disputes*. Paper presented in conference in the Wayne State University.

Schoenhaus, R.M. (2001). *Conflict management training.* Washington, DC: USIP.

Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S.,& Pratto, F. (1997) The interface between ethnic and national attachment: Ethnic pluralism or ethnic dominance? *Public Opinion Quarterly, 61,* 102-133.

Simon, B., Kulla, C., &Zobel, M. (1995) On being more than just a part of the whole: Regional identity and social distinctiveness. *European Journal of Social psychology, 25,* 325-340.

Skevington, S., &Baker, D. (Eds.). (1989). *The social identity of women.* London: Sage.

Smith, E.R., & Henry, S. (1996). An in- group becomes part of the self: Response time evidence. *Personality and Social psychology Bulletin, 22,* 635-642.

Stein, J. G. (1998) Image, identity, and conflict resolution. C.A. Crocker & F.O.Hampson (eds.), *Managing global chaos.* Washington, DC: USIP

Stern, P. (1995). Why do people sacrifice for their nations? *Political Psychology, 2,* 217-235.

Striker, S. (1969). Identity salience and role performance: the relevance of symbolic interaction theory for family research. *Journal of Marriage and the family, 30*, 558- 564.

Stryker, S., & Serpe, R.T. (1994). Identity salience and psychological centrality: Equivalent, overlapping, or complementary concepts? *Social Psychology Quarterly, 57,* 16-35

Stryker, S. (2000). Identity competition: Key to differential social movement participation? In S. Stryker, T. Owens, & R. White (Eds.), *Self, identity, and social movements* (pp.21-40). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tajfel H. (1986).The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S.Worshel & W.G. Austin (Eds.). *Psychology of Intregroup relations.* Chicago: Nelson –Hall.

Tajfel, H.,&Turner,J.C. (1979) An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G.Austin & S.Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-48). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ting -Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K.K., Shapiro, R., Garcia, W., Wright, T.J., & Oetzel J.G. (2000). Ethnic/ cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural* Relations, *24*, 47-81.

Turner,J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D.,& Watherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self- categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Turner,J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 454-463.

Vinacke, W. Edgar. 1957. "Stereotypes as Social Concepts." *Journal of Social Psychology* (November): 229-243.

Wilder D.A. (1981) Perceiving persons as a group: categorization and intergroup relations. In D. L. Hamilton (ed.*) Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 213-257

Urban, L. M. & Miller, M.(1998). A theoretical analysis of crossed categorization effects: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 894-908

Table I. Semantic deferential results in traditional trainings.

Ethnic relations in the Crimea are conflict			*1,5* **1, 63**					Ethnic relations in the Crimea are not conflict
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is hardly solving			*1, 4* **1, 25**					Ethnic conflict in the Crimea can be resolved
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is based profoundly		*2* **1,43**						Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is situational
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is easily controlled			*1,5* **1,9**					Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is spontaneous and uncontrollable
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
The intervention of third party is useful		**2**			*0,4*			The intervention of third party is dangerous
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is inveterate				*0,25* **0**				Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is changeable
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
There is possibility to construct the common "we"				**0,5**	*0, 8*			Differences between peoples in the Crimea are too big
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
The conflict between ethnic groups are inevitable	*2, 8*		**1, 09**					The conflicts can be avoided through the knowledge of its causes
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	

Note: *italic type*- values before training
bold type – values after training

Table II. Semantic deferential results in identity-based trainings.

Ethnic relations in the Crimea are conflict			*1,4* **1, 13**					Ethnic relations in the Crimea are not conflict
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is hardly solving			*1, 5*			**1, 45**		Ethnic conflict in the Crimea can be resolved
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is based profoundly			*1,6* **1,3**					Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is situational
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is easily controlled		*1,25* **2,45**						Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is spontaneous and uncontrollable
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
The intervention of third party is useful				*0* **0, 8**				The intervention of third party is dangerous
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is inveterate				*0*		**1, 4**		Ethnic conflict in the Crimea is changeable
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
There is possibility to construct the common "we"		**2,5**			*1*			Differences between peoples in the Crimea are too big
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	
The conflict between ethnic groups are inevitable	*2, 4*				**1, 09**			The conflicts can be avoided through the knowledge of its causes
	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	

Note: *italic type*- values before training
bold type – values after training